UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,550	09/15/2003	Eric Cosatto	2000-0042Con	2283

7590 06/26/2007			
S. H. Dworetsky			
AT&T Corp.		EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 4110		HAJNIK, DANIEL F	
Middletown, NJ 07748			

EXAMINER
HAJNIK, DANIEL F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 April 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *22-25,27-32,34 and 35* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *22-25,27-32,34 and 35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/13/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 22-25, 27, 29-32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ezzat et al. (NPL document, "Visual Speech Synthesis by Morphing

Visemes", herein referred to as "Ezzat") in view of Jiang et al. (NPL document, "Visual Speech

Analysis with Application to Mandarin Speech Training", herein referred to as "Jiang") in view

of Hon et al. (NPL Document,"Automatic Generation of Synthesis Units for Trainable Text-to-

Speech Systems", herein referred to as "Hon").

As per claims 22, 23, and 30, Ezzat teaches the claimed "selecting" step on top of 1st

column on pg. 51 and states:

"there are many intermediate frames that lie between the **chosen viseme images** ... Consequently, we compute **a series of consecutive optical flowvectors** between each intermediate image and its successor, and **concatenate** them all into one large flow vector that defines the global transformation between the chosen visemes". (emphasis added)

And states in the abstract:

we are able to synchronize the visual speech stream with the audio speech stream, and hence give the impression of a **photorealistic talking face**.
(emphasis added)

Here, the visemes represent a generic facial image that can be use to describe a particular sound and the flowvectors which contain visual and sound features are used in conjunction with the visemes.

Ezzat does not explicitly teach the claimed "obtaining" step. Jiang teaches the claimed "obtaining" step by stating in the abstract:

At each frame, region of interest is identified and **key information is extracted**. The preprocessed acoustic and visual information are then fed into a modular TDNN and combined for visual speech analysis. (emphasis added)

states on (pg. 114, 4.2 Acoustic and Visual Input Representation, 1st paragraph):

For acoustic data representation, we have followed the well-established approach to apply FFT on the Hamming windowed speech data to get 16 Melscale Fourier coefficients as input to the Acoustic input Layer. **For visual data representation,** we have performed the lip-tracking and feature points extraction task by applying our 2D multi-state lip shape model. Then we use both the color profile of the feature points on external and internal boundaries and position and movement of lip boundaries for feature extraction using principle component analysis (PCA). The **extracted feature vectors** are then fed to the Visual Input Layer. (emphasis added)

Here, the Jiang teaches feature vectors (target feature vector) and teaches of visual data (visual features) and acoustic information (non-visual information). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Ezzat with Jiang. Jiang

teaches one advantage to obtaining feature vectors in order to help children improve their speech

pronunciation (see section 5, pgs. 114-115, 1st paragraph) by providing audio-visual feedback.

Ezzat does not teach the claimed "unit selection process" and does not teach the claimed

"in which a longest possible candidate image sample is selected". Hon teaches the claimed "unit

selection process" by teaching of "Unit Selection" (title of section 4 on pg. 295) and suggests the

claimed "longest possible candidate image sample is selected" by teaching of:

> If large memory resources and a large speech database are
> available, it is possible to use a multiple-instance system **to
> construct long-units for frequent words and phrases that will
> undoubtedly achieve optimal concatenation quality**
> (top of 1st col on pg. 296)

In this instance, the phrases "multiple-instance system" and "achieve optimal concatenation"

would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to concept of selecting a longest possible

candidate image sample. This is because longer or longest candidate image samples can have

more words or sounds already connected within them and thus, less reconstruction of smaller

image samples is necessary. By avoiding these smaller reconstructions of sequences

(reconstruction through concatenation or joining samples together in a sequence) and by using

one longer one instead, optimal quality is achieved.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

combine Hon with the combinable system of Ezzat and Jiang. One advantage to the combination

is that with Hon, unit selection features selected from a database of a large amount of candidates

can produce optimal concatenation quality (top of 1st col on pg. 296).

As per claims 24-25, and 31-32, Ezzat teaches the claimed "selecting ... using a comparison of a combination of visual features and non-visual features with the target feature vector" by stating on pg. 47, 2nd col, 2nd paragraph:

> For any input text, we **determine the appropriate sequence** of **viseme morphs** to make, as well as the rate of the transformations by utilizing the output of the natural language processing unit (emphasis added)

In order to determine the appropriate sequence, the system would have to perform a comparison of visual and non-visual features with a given target vector in order to produce the output as stated. Further, this construction process of an appropriate sequence of viseme morphs would require selecting candidate image samples where these samples could be used to transition between through transformation.

Ezzat teaches the claimed compiling by teaching of concatenation (see quote from top of 1st column on pg. 51 above).

As per claim 27 and 34, Ezzat teaches the claimed first database by teaching of recording and collecting one image per English phoneme (bottom of 1st column on pg. 47 under "Corpus and Viseme Acquisition", also see figure 2).

Ezzat teaches the claimed second and third database by teaching of "Flow database" (pg. 54, 2nd column), which contain optical flow vectors which specify transition data between visemes (includes visual data and includes storing non-visual data i.e. sound transitions).

As per claim 29, Ezzat teaches the claimed first database in figure 2, the claimed second

database and the claimed third database on pg. 54, 2nd column under "Flow database" where this

database is formed to specify visual and non-visual data between animation transitions (frames).

3.   Claims 28 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezzat in

view of Jiang in further view of Hon in further of view of Brand (NPL Document, "Voice

Puppetry", herein referred to as "Brand").

As per claims 28 and 35, Ezzat does not teach the claimed limitations.

Brand teaches the claimed "selecting ... a number of candidates" and the claimed

"Viterbi search" by stating on the bottom half of the 1st col on pg. 25:

> The **Viterbi** sequence, while most likely, may only represent a small fraction of the total
> probability mass—**there may be thousands of slightly different state sequences that
> are nearly as likely**. If this were to happen in the voice puppet, V would be a very poor
> representation of the relevant information
> in the audio, and the animation quality would suffer greatly.
> ... These problems are virtually banished with entropically estimated models because
> **entropy minimization concentrates** the probability mass **on the optimal** Viterbi
> sequence. (emphasis added)

Brand teaches the claimed concatenation cost by stating on pg. 26, very bottom of 1st col

and very top of 2nd col:

> We quantified this with a squared **error measure** of divergence between groundtruth (x)
> and reconstructed (y) facial motion vectors, **weighted to penalize motions in the wrong
> direction**. (emphasis added)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine

Brand with the combinable system of Ezzat, Jiang, and Hon. Brand teaches the advantage of

using an optimal Viterbi sequence with a large number of state sequences (candidates) to reduce

the size to the most optimal ones in order to remove poor animation quality (1st col on pg. 25 see

quote above).

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/13/2007 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant's primary argument relates to the motivation and reasons to combine the references of

Ezzat and Hon (pages 3 to 6 in filed response). One primary reason applicant argues that the

combination is not proper is because Hon in section 2.2 criticizes the use of diphones (top of

page 4) and that the reference of Ezzat states that diphones are very good and are a fundamental

to the entire process of Ezzat for synthesizing video (second paragraph page 5).

The examiner acknowledges that Hon in section 2.2, criticizes the use of diphones. In one

instance, Hon states "there can be large distortions due to the difference in spectra between the

stationary parts of two units obtained from different contexts" (in section 2.2) in relation to the

use of diphones. Hon elaborates that the use of senones and triphones is preferred over diphones

(in section 2.3) because they allow for a "flexible memory-quality compromise" which has been

"well studied in the speech recognition community" (top of 1st col on page 294). However, the

examiner respectfully maintains that the rejections are proper for at least two reasons. First, the

prior art rejections of record presented in the office action do not explicitly rely upon Hon for

teaching diphones but rather only the unit selection process. The purpose behind the cited unit

selection process is primarily to pick a best candidate instance in order to achieve the best quality

output. The unit selection process is cited by the examiner to stress the process of selecting an

instance for better concatenation from a database or pool of possible instances. The unit

selection process is not cited to emphasize the use diphone alternatives. Second, according to the

disclosure of section 2.2 in Hon, the technology used in place of diphones enhances the use of

diphones and is also well known in the art. The fact that this technology is well known in the art

would support to conclusion that one of ordinary skill can combine the references of Ezzat and

Hon into a workable combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would achieve the

combination by using the improved technology of Hon to improve Ezzat. Furthermore, the

enhanced qualities achieved beyond diphones would even motivate one of ordinary skill in the

art to build the combination in order to achieve a higher quality output. For at least these

reasons, the examiner respectfully maintains that the combination of prior references is proper.

Conclusion

2.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel F. Hajnik whose telephone number is (571) 272-7642. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30A-5:00P).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka J. Chauhan can be reached on (571) 272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DFH

Ulka Chauhan
Supervisor Patent Examiner